## Interview Summary

Application No. 09/436,159 Applicant(s)

Barbera-Guillem et al.

Examiner

Arun Chakrabarti

Group Art Unit 1655



(1) <u>Arun Chakrabarti</u>		(3)
(2) Bud Nelson		
Date of Interview	Oct 26, 2000	
Type: 🛭 Telephonic	☐ Personal (copy is given to	applicant applicant's representative).
Exhibit shown or demons	stration conducted:   Yes	☒ No. If yes, brief description:
Agreement 🛛 was read	ched.	
ldentification of prior art None	discussed:	
Applicant was advised to the allowability of all per	o send a terminal disclaimer. Ap	o if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: oplicant agreed to send the same. Applicant was informed about including the method claims as rejoined in re Ochiai. Applicant also ther prosecution.

the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendents which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. 🛮 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.